

REMARKS**I. Specification**

The abstract of the disclosure was objected to because the legal phraseology "Means" was set forth in line 4. The appropriate correction has been made by removing the "Means" phraseology and replacing it with suitable descriptive language.

II. Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention as specified in the claims. Therefore, the lid for covering the document holder as set forth in claim 22 must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim.

In the interests of prosecution efficiency, claim 22 has been cancelled.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 4-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 4, line 6, "the outer edge of the bottom surface" lacked antecedent basis in the claims. Claim 4 has been canceled and its rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 moot.

In each of claims 5 and 21, the preamble was unclear because it did not include the holder of the parent claims. Both claims have been amended to include – holder – after "The ETC tag" in the preamble so that the holder of the parent claims is included therein.

In claim 21, "the panel" was unclear with respect to which of the previously claimed plurality of panels is being referred to. The word – back – has been added before "panel" to indicate that claim 4 refers to the vertically planar back panel of the claims.

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brincat. In the interests of prosecution efficiency, those claims have been cancelled.

Claims 1-5, 9, 12 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Devito. In the interests of prosecution efficiency, claims 1-4 and 12 have been cancelled. Claims 5, 9 and 21 have been rewritten to depend from claim 13 which the Examiner indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner, and is therefore allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 9 and 21 are therefore allowable as well on the basis of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

V. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeVito in view of Moore. Claim 10 now depends from claim 13, which the Examiner indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner, and is therefore allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is therefore allowable as well on the basis of its dependency from an allowable base claim.

Claims 18, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeVito in view of Schumer. Claims 18, 23 and 24 have been rewritten to depend from claim

13 which the Examiner indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner, and is therefore allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18, 23 and 24 are therefore allowable as well on the basis of their dependency from an allowable base claim.


VI. Allowable subject matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 6-8, 11 and 13-17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claims have been so amended and the applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-8, 11, 13-17 and all their dependent claims are presently in condition for allowance.

VII. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all bases for rejection have been overcome and the present application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Salvatore J. Maiorino
Reg. No. 42,830

827 Hylan Blvd.
Staten Island, NY 10305
(917)703-0700